UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,305	05/07/2001	Thomas Dixon	11593-002001	8670

26171	7590	05/17/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
DAVIS, CYNTHIA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2665	

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/849,305	DIXON ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Cynthia L Davis	2665	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *4/4/2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 4

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments, filed 4/4/2005, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s)

1-5, 7-24, 26-37 and 39 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the

rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of

rejection is made in view of Jones.

2.   Applicant's arguments, filed 4/4/2005, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s) 6

and 25 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has

been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is

made in view of Jones in view of Levine.

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 4/4/2005 regarding claim 38 have been fully

considered but they are not persuasive. The log-on process disclosed in Stuntebeck

would inherently include the step of verifying if the log-on identification is valid before

allowing the user to access the directory information. The rejection to claim 38 is made

final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1-5, 7-24, 26-37, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Jones.

Regarding claim 1, receiving a message with a universal address is disclosed in Jones, column 8, lines 35-38. Sending a request for processing the universal address to a universal address service provider and receiving a message delivery location based on the universal address is disclosed in Jones, column 8, lines 36-37. Routing the message to the message delivery location is disclosed in Jones, column 8, lines 35-38 (the message is routed to the associated objects).

Regarding claim 2, sending a universal address service provider descriptor and user name is disclosed in Jones, column 3, lines 5-8 (the query would have to specify which directory to query against), and column 5, line 38.

Regarding claim 3, sending a message type, universal address service provider descriptor, and user name, is disclosed in Jones, column 10, lines 50-55 (disclosing processing based on message type), column 3, lines 5-8 (the query would have to specify which directory to query against), and column 5, lines 38.

Regarding claim 4, sending the request comprising a message service provider identification is disclosed in Jones, column 3, lines 5-8 (the query would have to specify which directory to query against).

Regarding claim 5, receiving a message delivery location being based on the message service provider identification is disclosed in Jones, column 3, lines 5-8 (disclosing the message service provider identification being needed to specify which directory to use) and column 6, lines 40-41.

Regarding claim 7, receiving a message with a universal address comprising receiving one of a phone number, pager message, and facsimile is disclosed in Jones, column 5, lines 36-41, and column 6, lines 41-43.

Regarding claim 8, receiving a message with a universal address comprising receiving an email is disclosed in Jones, column 6, line 50.

Regarding claim 9, receiving a universal address is disclosed in Jones, column 5, line 2. Determining the identity of the universal address requestor is disclosed in Jones, column 8, lines 42-43. Accessing a database of universal addresses is disclosed in Jones, column 2, lines 66-67. Transmitting the message delivery location to the requestor is disclosed in column 6, lines 40-41. Receiving a message type and determining a message delivery location based on the message type is disclosed in Jones, column 9, lines 54-61.

Regarding claim 10, determining that the identity has been granted access to the message delivery location wherein the transmitting is performed only if it is determined that access has been granted is disclosed in column 7, lines 20-26 of Jones.

Regarding claim 11, receiving a request to change the message delivery location and storing a new message delivery location is disclosed in Jones, column 5, line 66-column 6-lines 2 (attributes for a handle may be changed).

Regarding claim 12, selecting one message delivery location from a plurality of message delivery locations associated with the universal address is disclosed in column 5, lines 39-42 (disclosing multiple delivery locations).

Regarding claim 13, receiving a universal address service provider descriptor and user name is disclosed in Jones, column 3, lines 5-8 (the query would have to specify which directory to query against), and column 5, line 38.

Regarding claim 14, determining the identity of the universal address requestor comprising receiving a message service provider identification is disclosed in Jones, column 3, lines 5-8 (the query would have to specify which directory to query against).

Regarding claim 15, accessing the database of universal addresses comprising determining if the message service provider has been granted access to the message delivery location corresponding to the universal address is disclosed in Jones, column 3, lines 5-8 (disclosing the message service provider identification being needed to specify which directory to use) and column 6, lines 40-41.

Regarding claims 16 and 18, determining the message delivery location comprising determining an address is disclosed in column 6, lines 50-51 (disclosing multiple types of addresses, one must be selected).

Regarding claim 17, determining the message delivery location comprising determining one of a phone number, pager number, and facsimile number is disclosed in Jones, column 5, lines 38-42.

Regarding claim 19, a message service provider comprising an interface for receiving a message with a universal address is disclosed is disclosed in Jones, column 8, lines 35-38. A processor for generating a request to a universal address service provider for a message deliver location based on the universal address is disclosed in Jones, column 8, lines 36-37. An interface for receiving the requested message

delivery location, wherein the message service provider routes the message based on the received message delivery location is disclosed in Jones, column 8, lines 35-38 (the message is routed to the associated objects).

Regarding claim 20, the processor including a server connected to the internet is disclosed in Jones, column 3, lines 46-48.

Regarding claim 21, an interface for sending the generated request wherein the request comprises a universal address service provider descriptor and name is disclosed in Jones, column 3, lines 5-8 (the query would have to specify which directory to query against), and column 5, line 38.

Regarding claim 22, sending a message type, universal address service provider descriptor, and user name is disclosed in Jones, column 10, lines 50-55 (disclosing processing based on message type), column 3, lines 5-8 (the query would have to specify which directory to query against), and column 5, lines 38.

Regarding claim 23, an interface for sending the request comprising a message service provider identification is disclosed in Jones, column 3, lines 5-8 (the query would have to specify which directory to query against).

Regarding claim 24, the message delivery location being based on the message service provider identification is disclosed in Jones, column 3, lines 5-8 (disclosing the message service provider identification being needed to specify which directory to use) and column 6, lines 40-41.

Regarding claim 26, receiving a message with a universal address comprising receiving one of a phone number, pager message, and facsimile is disclosed in Jones, column 5, lines 36-41, and column 6, lines 41-43.

Regarding claim 27, receiving a message with a universal address comprising receiving an email is disclosed in Jones, column 6, line 50.

Regarding claim 28, an interface for receiving a universal address is disclosed in Jones, column 8, lines 35-38. A processor for determining the identity of the universal address requestor is disclosed in Jones, column 8, lines 42-43. An interface for delivering the message delivery location to the requestor is disclosed in column 6, lines 40-41. A database of message delivery locations is disclosed in Jones, column 2, lines 66-67. An interface for receiving a message type and the processor determining a message delivery location based on the message type is disclosed in Jones, column 9, lines 54-61.

Regarding claim 29, determining that the processor determines that the identity has been granted access to the message delivery location wherein the transmitting is performed only if it is determined that access has been granted is disclosed in column 7, lines 20-26 of Jones.

Regarding claim 30, the processor receiving a request to change the message delivery location and storing a new message delivery location is disclosed in Jones, column 5, line 66-column 6-lines 2 (attributes for a handle may be changed).

Regarding claim 31, the processor selecting one message delivery location from a plurality of message delivery locations associated with the universal address is disclosed in column 5, lines 39-42 (disclosing multiple delivery locations).

Regarding claim 32, the processor using a user name to determine the message delivery location is disclosed in Jones, column5, lines 36-42 (disclosing locations associated with handle).

Regarding claim 33, determining the identity of the requestor comprises receiving a message service provider identification is disclosed in Jones, column 3, lines 5-8 (the query would have to specify which directory to query against).

Regarding claim 34, determining the message deliver location comprises determining an address is disclosed in column 6, lines 50-51 (disclosing multiple types of addresses, one must be selected).

Regarding claim 35, determining the address delivery location comprising determining one of a phone number, pager message, and facsimile is disclosed in Jones, column 5, lines 36-41, and column 6, lines 41-43.

Regarding claim 36, determining an email address is disclosed in Jones, column 6, line 50.

Regarding claim 37, a message delivery system comprising a message service provider is disclosed in Jones, figure 2, element 720. A universal address service provider is disclosed in Jones, figure 2, element 700, and column 5, lines 1-2. A universal address service provider authority for managing the message delivery system wherein the message service provider accesses the universal address service provider

to determine a message delivery location is disclosed in Jones, column 12, lines 9-16

(the authority interacts with the directory to get the universal address).

Regarding claim 39, a memory for storing a universal address is disclosed in

Jones, figure 2, element 700, and column 5, lines 1-2. An interface for sending the

universal address to a universal address service provider and an interface for receiving

a message delivery location associated with the universal address from the universal

address service provider is disclosed in Jones, column 8, lines 36-37. A processor for

sending a message with the received message delivery location is disclosed in Jones,

column 8, lines 35-38 (the message is routed to the associated objects).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

5.   Claims 6 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Jones in view of Levine.

Regarding claim 6, receiving a message with a universal address comprising

receiving a letter or package is missing from Jones. However, receiving a letter or a

package is disclosed in Levine, column 28, line 46-column 29, line 17. It would have

been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to receive a letter or

packing with a universal address. The motivation would be to implement the universal

address system for delivery of mail or packages.

Regarding claim 25, receiving a message with a universal address comprising

receiving a letter or package is missing from Jones. However, receiving a letter or a

package is disclosed in Levine, column 28, line 46-column 29, line 17. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to receive a letter or packing with a universal address. The motivation would be to implement the universal address system for delivery of mail or packages.

6.   Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuntebeck in view of Levine. A method for updating an address comprising receiving a universal address, receiving an identification, determining whether the identification is valid, and accessing a database of universal addresses if the identification is valid is disclosed in Stuntebeck, column 3, lines 52-55. Claim 38 further specifies automatically changing a marker for a message delivery location for the received universal address associated with a message service from a first message delivery location to a second message delivery location, which is missing from Stuntebeck. This is disclosed in Levine, column 9, lines 54-58 (redirecting a network path would necessarily entail changing the message delivery location from a first to a second location). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to change the delivery location at the user's request. The motivation would be to give the user flexibility in choosing delivery locations.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cynthia L Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3117. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 6, Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (703) 272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CLD
5/2/2004

HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600